

*11/11/18 Hipp  
\* housing search,  
mattress*

## JUSTINA FUGH INTERVIEW

- Recording & Preamble
- Thank you for taking time to meet with us
- Introductions & Credentials
- Purpose of meeting:
  - Determine facts surrounding Administrator Pruitt's lease of 223 C Street NE, specifically:
    - EPA, OGE's involvement with its opinion;
    - Was EPA, OGE personnel pressured before, during, and/or after the opinion.
  - Determine facts surrounding EPA OGE's involvement with recent ethical matters reported in the news.

*gift, misuse of position*

## QUESTIONS

### • EPA, OGE'S OPINION GIVEN FOR ADMINISTRATOR'S LEASE AT 223 C STREET, NE

OBJECTIVE: DEVELOP SUFFICIENT FACTS TO DETERMINE THE DETAILS BEHIND OGE'S OPINION

- Please provide chronological details of your knowledge and involvement with the Administrator's lease at 223 C Street.
  - How, what, when, where, why and how?
- Follow up questions
  - When was the condo opinion officially given? Was it by you?
    - If 2018, why then and not 2017?
  - What were the factors that went into your decision?
  - When were you made aware of the condo and its specifics?
  - What was your understanding of the lease terms?
  - How did you determine market value?
  - What was your knowledge of the Hart and their lobbying relating to a gift?
  - How did the factors change after your opinion was issued, i.e. daughter, unfettered access, etc?

### • PRESSURE BY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE ON EPA, OGE REGARDING THE ETHICS OPINION OR INVOLVMENT

OBJECTIVE: DEVELOP SUFFICIENT FACTS TO DETERMINE POSSIBLE PRESSURE BY EPA OA ON EPA OGE

- Was there any pressure provided on you regarding the lease opinion? How about any others in OGE?
  - If so, by whom? How, verbally &/or email? What was said?
  - Was it implied?
  - Was Kevin Minoli pressured? If so, by whom?

- Did Minoli pressure you?
  - Did he intentionally withhold facts pertaining to your opinion?
  - Did anyone else withhold facts?
- Were you offered anything of value for your opinion? Did you receive anything?
  - Anyone else?

- **RECENT NEWS OF GIFTS RECEIVED BY ADMINISTRATOR PRUITT**

OBJECTIVE: DEVELOP SUFFICIENT FACTS TO DETERMINE EPA OGE'S INVOLVEMENT WITH RECENT GIFTS

- Do you know if OGE has opined about the gifts that the Administrator may have received that have been recently featured in the news, i.e. Kentucky basketball tickets, Rose Bowl tickets, etc?
- Do you know if OGE has opined about the matters pertaining to the Administrator's wife?
- Ask if other Agent has any questions.
- Ask if Interviewee has any questions.
- Thank them again.
- Postamble.
- Stop Recording.

The Honorable Trey Gowdy  
Chairman  
Committee on Oversight and Government Reform  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This responds to your letter, dated April 11, 2018, to Administrator Pruitt requesting documents related to the Administrator's lease agreement with Ms. Vicki Hart and ethics memoranda related to that lease.

Enclosed please find documents pertaining to the lease agreement and the March 30, 2018, and April 4, 2018, ethics memoranda. The documents are consistent with the findings of the ethics memoranda that career EPA ethics officials believe the Administrator's "entering into the lease was consistent with federal ethics regulations regarding gifts, and use of the property in accordance with the lease agreement did not constitute a gift as defined in those regulations."

We will work with your staff to accommodate review of additional documents on this topic at the EPA. If additional documents responsive to these requests are found, we will produce them as well.

Please note that portions of the responsive documents contain internal deliberations, attorney-client communications, or attorney-work-product of an Executive Branch agency, the EPA, and, as such, raise a confidentiality interest. To identify specific documents in which the EPA has a confidentiality interest, we have added a watermark to these documents that reads "Deliberative or Privileged Document of the U.S. EPA; Disclosure Authorized Only to Congress for Oversight Purposes." Each document contains a footnote stating that privilege in this context may include, but is not limited to, attorney-client privileged or work-product protected information. Through this accommodation, the EPA does not waive any confidentiality interests in these documents or similar documents in other circumstances. The EPA respectfully requests that the Committee and staff protect the documents and the information contained in them from further dissemination. Should the Committee determine that its legislative mandate requires further distribution of this confidential information outside the Committee, we request that such need first be discussed with the EPA to help ensure the Executive Branch's confidentiality interests are protected to the fullest extent possible.

You will also notice that some of the documents contain redactions of nonresponsive or personal privacy information. We redacted this information in a manner that does not obscure the identity of any individuals involved in the relevant communications.

If you have further questions, your staff may contact Erik Baptist, Senior Deputy General Counsel, at (202) 564-1689 or Baptist.Erik@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

Matthew Z. Leopold  
General Counsel

Enclosures

cc: The Honorable Elijah E. Cummings  
Ranking Member

Thank you for your letter  
we share your concern and respect for  
agency ethical stds  
several issues raised  
EPA ethics officials lack investigatory powers  
will coordinate w/ OIG  
have sent your letter to OIG  
will coordinate & advise on application of  
ethics rules based upon their findings